

## Faults in the Bed-Rock

FRANCIS P. LeBUFFE, S.J.

*Paper read before the Twenty-sixth Annual Session of the New York State Conference of Charities and Correction, Hotel Roosevelt, New York City, Dec. 9, 1925.*

THE long day has waned over the whirling city, and out from the fastnesses of the business world where men fought so lustily for the gold that buys the playthings of time, tired men have hurried home to seek short respite from their gruelling game. The roar of the world has been hushed a bit and as the sun robes itself in dying splendor, flicking its last rays across the Pacific waters, evening settles down and all seems wontedly peaceful. Within the homes loved ones tell loved ones of what the day had brought in sorrow and in joy. Other some look to a night of sleep to ease their pain-racked bodies, and other some have hurried forth to drink in their fill of pleasure where sweet music speeds the lagging hours and drowns out the serious notes in life's deep harmony. Peace there is upon the surface of the earth whereon life throbs, but there is much fateful brooding in nature, for down, deep down, the depths are stirring and there is no man to note their stir. Here a stress and there a strain, here a thrust and there a yielding, and then as though some huge giant turned restlessly in his sleep, the very foundations of the unthinking city slipped and with one vast roar of crashing walls that silenced the very death-cries of the doomed, San Francisco lay in ruins. The fault in the bed-rock had given and man and the works of man lay heaped as broken toys when wilful children play.

Seismologists today begin to plot and plan the ways of earthquakes and place their finger warningly now on this spot, now on that, and tell us that some day—it may be soon and it may be late—wreckage will be strewn upon the earth's fair surface because the bed-rock gave. Other some will tell us that the earth will rise and shake itself

free from the puny incumbrances of man, because, seeping down into molten rock through the crevices in the floor of the ocean, the waters are turned into expanding steam which disrupts and rends asunder the solid crust above.

### CIVILIZATION'S BED-ROCK

So too in the life and ways of men, there are certain things that are the bed-rock of civilization and when that bed-rock shows a fault and slips or when disruptive forces rend the ways of men, disaster stalks the land. There is little need, it would seem, to stress the importance of that unit which lies at the very foundation of our societal life. Whatever may be our religious creed, whatever may be our political views, whatever may be our sociological outlook, before us stands the gaunt, stark problem of our family life. That this unit, primordial both biologically and sociologically, is not in its aforesaid vigor, that thereby one of the greatest, if not the greatest dynamic is inoperative to the intense harm of the social whole, is the conviction, growing both in intensity and in expression, of all thinking men.

Surely none of us will deny that the family is the very bed-rock of civilization, that with it pure and intact, civilization is intact, and with it gone, civilization is no more. Furthermore, we may safely state that to all the family is indeed more than an aggregation of folk who pool their resources and eat and sleep beneath the same roof. There are deeper and more abiding values in the family than can be read upon its surface, and these are the real values, the values which make that unit the primary unit of civilized societal life. They are the very warp and woof of family life and give it that strong texture by reason of which it supports civilization itself. In the loom of societal life, as the shuttle of custom and social standards swing back and forth, it is from the family that the intertwining life-threads are drawn and as these lives are strong and true, so too will the finished cloth of our social whole be sound and so too will it wear well under the friction incident to existence; but be these lives weak and frayed, so too will the social whole be a sordid thing with no attractiveness to right-minded men.

And what, may we ask, are these real values which give to the family its worth? They are unseen, intangible

indeed and yet most seen, most touched, most realized. As Francis Thompson has well said of even higher spiritual things:

O world invisible, we view thee,  
O world intangible, we touch thee,  
O world unknowable, we know thee,  
Inapprehensible, we clutch thee!

The things of sense are real; but many another thing is more real to the spirit of man and to the life of man that overtops in many ways the things of sense and time.

### ONENESS OF FAMILY BOND

The first of these spiritual values we take to be the oneness of the family spirit. In every biological sentient unit there is oneness of consciousness which makes it a psychic whole. Are we not right then in demanding such unity of consciousness in that biological unit which it is our duty to consider now? There must be a oneness of mind, born of a oneness of purpose and rooted in a oneness of love, that unites father with mother and both of them with the children. Father and mother must indeed be "of one mind and one heart," if they are to have happiness in their home, and are to bring up children who will be well-mannered before God and man. Yet it is precisely this harmonious blending of two distinct and yet mutually complementary souls that presupposes and partially causes, and at the same time follows, as an effect, the numerical oneness of the marriage tie. There can be an adequacy of equal love only where there is reciprocal undividedness of love, and this presupposes numerical unity. Indeed at the very basis of the family lies monogamy, the abiding union of one man and one woman. There have been and are deflections, many and varied, and at times degrading, deflections from this ideal, but, as it was the original, so it has been the enduring, and now exists as the most universal form of marriage.

Of course, for years it has been customary to assert with Bachofen, McLennan, Morgan and others that the human race began with a state of sexual promiscuity wherein men and women mated as animals do. The falsity of this position has been adequately shown by no

less an evolutionist than Westermarck and accepted and confirmed by another of the ranking evolutionists of today, J. Arthur Thomson. We read in Westermarck (*The History of Human Marriage*, Vol. I, Ch. iii, p. 125): "Even if there really are or have been peoples living in a state of promiscuity, which has never been proved and is exceedingly hard to believe, these people do not afford evidence whatever for promiscuity having ruled in primitive times." Again (Vol. I, Ch. ix, p. 336): "It is not, of course, impossible that among some peoples the intercourse between the sexes may have been almost promiscuous. But the hypothesis according to which promiscuity has formed a general stage in the social history of mankind, instead of belonging—as Giraud-Teulon puts it—to the class of hypotheses which are scientifically permissible, is in my opinion one of the most unscientific ever set forth within the whole domain of sociological speculation." Again Prof. Thomson, than whom there is no better known writer in matters scientific, says (*What is Man?* Ch. ii, pp. 59, 60): "The general result is that we may with a clear intellectual conscience brush away the nightmare picture of primitive man as indulging in promiscuity like rabbits. He was a married man. Nay more, there is a very strong case for regarding monogamy as primitive." This unity of marriage which underlies the unity of conscious purposefulness of the family is tremendously important these days, for Prof. Thomson again tells us (p. 59): "What civilized man requires to depart from is indulgence in polygamous habits behind a screen of formally monogamous marriage." The scandals that increasingly soil our daily papers and which of late years have almost torn apart our social fabric, the sordid tales heard in our Domestic Relations Courts, ill-smelling scandals that our yellow-journals gloat over with carrion-instincts, and the privately confessed wrong-doings of those whose public reputations are still more or less intact, warn us that the family is not secure. It profits one little to be an alarmist, but prudence itself bids us raise our voices in warning protest when our folk, young and old, are taught to excuse their sex delinquencies by the invocation of "atavistic reversions" to "caveman" ancestry, when too we are blatantly greeted day by day with tales of "soul-mates," "affinities," "co-respondents" and other soft-

names for repellent facts. Nasty things become less nasty when we meet them often, and so the current fashions of marital infidelity and its inevitable disruption of family unity both physical and psychic will grow more prevalent if the unity of the marriage-tie between one man and one woman, abidingly respected and abidingly observed, be not insisted upon.

#### RENDING THE FAMILY BOND

But this spiritual and essential fact of oneness of mind and oneness of heart is offset not only by lack of physical oneness, it is offset or rather adequately nullified by the dissolution of the marriage-tie, for breakage of this bond means disruption of the family. Just as in the purely physical order male and female are the principles of bodily generation, so too in that higher order of the unfolding of the latent soul-life of the child, father and mother must, through the years, blend all their efforts that shielded childhood may grow into stalwart youth, and youth developing gracefully must give way to maturer years of useful service to God and Man. Some of us hold to the absolute indissolubility of the tie which unites man and woman as husband and wife; others hold to an exceptional dissolubility for reasons exceedingly grave. Yet back of these differences of position, we are all agreed that the ideal which every true man holds before him is that of the wife whose love will be his undividedly forever, whose sole thought will be for the little ones who are the enduring evidences of their mutual affection, whose supreme effort will be to give him that sweetest of all havens—a home! We are all likewise agreed that the dream of every noble-minded girl is that of a man whose heart she will hold as hers unreservedly and irrevocably, upon whose strong shoulders she may lean when the strain of life is hard and at whose side she may walk merrily when laughter abounds. That is the ideal—one man and one woman journeying through life, each an abiding keepsake unto the other. Yet where is that ideal in the world at large today? Again, let us glance at the so-called primitives, those poor fellows invoked so often to prove that our ancestors were a wild and motley crew of animal profligates. What is the condition of marriage there? L. T. Hobhouse tells us (*Morals in Evolution*, Vol. I, p.

150): "Marriage is indissoluble among the Andamanese, some Papuans of New Guinea, (certain tribes) in Sumatra, among the Igorrotes and Italonos of the Philippines, the Veddas of Ceylon, and in the Romish Church." Philo L. Mills, in his epoch-making book, *Prehistoric Religion*, commenting on this passage, says (p. 35): "And he might have added—among the aborigines of Malakka, among the Aeta of the Philippines, among the Wild Dyaks of Borneo, among the Toalas of Celebes, among many of the American and Australian aborigines and among the Negrillos of Central Africa."

Before looking at our own country, let us glance at Europe. According to an Associated Press dispatch of July 21, 1924, the Soviet Government of Russia grants within five minutes at the cost of \$1.50 a divorce which is desired by both parties and with only a single restriction, viz., that one must not be divorced and remarried more than three times in one year. Indeed of late, press reports have told us of the intent to do away with marriage altogether. In Switzerland, where divorce is as easy to obtain as in the United States, there is only one divorce to every sixteen marriages. In other countries the divorce ratio is still lower. In France, there is one divorce to twenty-one marriages; in Denmark, one to twenty-two; in Germany and New Zealand, one to twenty-four; in Norway, one to thirty; in Sweden, one to thirty-three; in Great Britain, one to ninety-six; while our neighbor, Canada, has only one divorce to every 161 marriages. Even pagan Japan had in 1919 a lower divorce rate than the United States, for it had only one divorce to every eight marriages.

Now for our own record which furnishes food for much serious thought. In 1890, there was but one divorce for 17.1 marriages; in 1900, one divorce to 12.7 marriages; in 1906, one divorce to 9.3 marriages, and in 1922, one divorce to 7.6 marriages. The whole range is run from South Carolina, where none may obtain a divorce on any grounds whatsoever, to Nevada, wherein we had the alarming spectacle of one divorce for every nine-tenths of a marriage. Put in another way—for the ten years ending with 1876, there were 122,121 divorces in the United States; from 1876 to 1866, 206,595; from 1886 to 1896, 352,263; from 1896 to 1906, 593,362; from 1906

to 1916, 975,728, making a total of 2,250,069. Picture what that means: 2,250,069 homes broken and we social workers are schooled to try with infinite patience to heal over the breaches that we find in even one home! 2,250,069 life-dreams shattered, for say what we may, the normal man and woman have a distinct dream in their hearts upon their marriage day. It is right, indeed, to grow thoughtful over individual cases and to picture the sorrows of a weary mother shielding her tender brood against a drunken father, and to limn in appealing colors the broken husband folding in at night his little ones from whom the fateful lure of a mad world's pleasures have torn a forgetful mother. But again, whatever be our principles touching on such cases we must face facts and look at the Frankenstein monster that is loose upon our people today, sapping the very vitals of our family life. We execrate three marriages a year at the dissolution cost of three dollars for the two prior ones, but what of our own good country? 2,250,069 broken homes and yet we feature in our daily papers, the fifth so-called marriage of a prominent woman to one who is to carry the decent title of husband. 2,250,069 broken homes, and yet hear our younger folk pleading for a larger liberty; read the works of many professors who hold indissoluble marriage to be but a social convention to be set aside at will; glance at newspaper and magazine articles which favor trial marriages and of course divorce at will; listen to the popular cant upon separation, whereby as Chesterton says (*The Superstition of Divorce*, Ch. iv, p. 53): "So the unfortunate man who cannot tolerate the woman he has chosen from all the women of the world is not encouraged to return to her and tolerate her, but encouraged to choose another woman whom he may in due course refuse to tolerate."

#### UNHOLY ANTE-NUPTIAL FREEDOM

These two spiritual aspects of marriage are the very bed-rock of family life and so of civilization itself, and yet it is clear to all of us that there is a far-reaching fault in that bed-rock and that the fault is slipping not gradually, but with the onward sweep of an avalanche and the worthwhile things not only of cultured life, but of life itself are themselves being swept away. But just as in earth

convulsions, so too there are in family life disruptive forces that are seeping in and rending it asunder. This seepage of example of ante-nuptial freedom between the sexes is assuredly as wrecking a force as post-nuptial infidelity and divorce. How can there be that unity of life, that oneness of purpose in seeking the worth-while things of life if there has been years of disregard for the very sanctities of life themselves?

We have often heard it said that a young man must sow his wild oats, and the modern young woman is unfortunately quite frank in like claim. This is a question about which most of us would prefer to remain silent, but the time has come to speak out bluntly, even where reticence would be far more to one's taste. Some will tell us that morals have no place here. But what after all is morality? Morality is the alignment of our actions as human beings with the ultimate purposes of our rational nature. To deflect any human faculty from its fore-ordained purpose is therefore immoral, for it is a perversion. Now, God has made man as he is, and woman as she is for one purpose—to re-people the earth and to secure this purpose He has planted in nature a strong impulse thereto and pleasure therein. Our young men and young women must be taught that it is a degraded and degrading thing to misuse the primordial impulses of life or to act so frivolously that there is serious danger of grave lapses, and my own belief is that our girls imperatively need to be taught this most emphatically.

We hear many a protest against "the double standard." Of course, there is no double standard in morals. What is wrong for the woman is wrong for the man. But may I say that our instinctively higher standards for woman is rooted in the very make-up of her nature? Man may sin and none can find a trace of his unholiness, but when a woman sins her very nature bears the signs and frequently the shadow of her sin clings to her through life as the child of another unwed mother. No, no double standard for sin, but has not the God of nature kindly imposed a higher standard of virtue on those whose highest title is that of mother? If our girls are modest and respectful of themselves, if they have that proper restraint which is a protection to that fundamental virtue that every man demands in the woman who is to be not his concubine but



his wife, then we need fear little for our boys. Our young women owe this to themselves for their own safety, first, because only the brute will take advantage of a modest girl, and again, because no man ever yet looked on a woman as his equal. Therein is the tragedy of the modern girl, for she tries to be a "pal" with the boys. By a law of man's mind, detectable by observation and confirmed by history, a man cannot look on woman as his equal. He either looks up to her, or down on her—and if he looks down on her, she pays the penalty.

The great difficulty facing the family today is the unholy freedom of our young folk, whose license prior to marriage refuses to be summarily checked by the few words of a marriage formula, hastily pronounced by them before a clergyman or licensing officer of the law. That young men and women can and do lead such a continent life is a certainty, as it is the privilege of one in my position to know. Moreover, even in the American Expeditionary Forces, it was found that 34 per cent. of the 13,649 men who answered a questionnaire had remained chaste during the time of their stay in France, a period varying from eight months to two years. And is it not the secret hope and cherished conviction of each one of you that your sons and above all your daughters, your brothers and more especially your sisters are such? And would you not feli the man that insinuated otherwise?

### SOCIAL CHASTITY

But why this admitted breakdown in the morality of our younger generation? It is the seepage of the morally unwholesome atmosphere abroad in the community today that little by little infiltrates into the minds of our youth and sunders the forces of their moral being. It is of little profit for us to try to keep our own houses clean and hygienic if the atmosphere all around us is miasmatic and fever-laden. There can be no protection for the family if the atmosphere of the community at large be not morally wholesome, if there be not social chastity; for if there be no social chastity we have but a tainted race of younger folk which will not, cannot blend their lives in holy wedlock. That there has been decadence here is a fact that all men have noted. Fashions are tolerated today, pictures are printed in our daily papers and on the covers of our

magazines which would have been matters for arrest a few years back. The motion pictures are frequently either lewd or frankly suggestive, and many of our plays on the so-called legitimate stage are utterly pornographic. Our boys and girls are arrested for sex-delinquencies and unmarried mothers are frequently social outcasts, and yet what have the boys and girls done? Only that to which we allow them to be openly tempted by what we permit in public. Play juries may whitewash all they want and play-writers may prate about art and clamor for freedom in the name of art, but the fact remains that there are plays and movies and illustrations, and magazine articles and books today—and unfortunately many of them—that are open incentives to sin. Why prattle about “art” and, then when our young folks have followed out these “artistic” appeals, damn them as sex-delinquents? Why not then allow a plea for “art?” How illogical we are! Why do we not do one of two things—either stop arresting our young folk for doing the very things to which we allow them to be provoked or clean up our stage, our movies and our literature? You tell me there is no absolutely certain way of telling whether a thing is bad or not? With this I beg leave to differ. May I offer you a simple test for the cleanness of a show or a book? Would you want your daughter or your sister to take the leading sinister part therein or be found reading the stuff that a man may write for her but dare not say to her in person? And if it is too bad for your daughter or your sister, why will you lower your manhood or your womanhood by seeing another man’s daughter or sister debasing her priceless heritage?

Added to this degrading influence of the stage, we have to thank our prohibition laws for a further accentuation which is a blot on our country. High School parties now are such that a public official said that no such things occurred in “red-light” districts years ago. Drink and immodest dressing and animal dances brought out from darkest Africa or borrowed from the houses of ill-fame of South America, these we permit and then meet, here and there and everywhere in solemn convention, to see how we can cure the inevitable effects which have worked themselves out upon young folk. Only recently in New York, a woman teacher congratulated an audience

of young ladies that they had enjoyed a "freedom without anchorage." Yes, they have a "freedom without anchorage," for they have been taught that the Ten Commandments are mere outworn social taboos, that restraint is intolerable, that the old ways are foolish ways. But are they to be congratulated on this? As well congratulate a rudderless ship adrift in the whirlpool for its freedom from anchorage, as to congratulate our boys and girls because they know not these saving truths and stabilizing restraints without which the very fabric of individual life is ruined and the warp and woof of societal life is rent asunder. Because there is little of social chastity, there is little individual chastity. Because there is little social and individual chastity, our homes are ruined, fathers and mothers are not faithful each to each, and the dockets of our divorce courts are crowded, children are bandied about from one divorcee to another or parked as automobiles are, parentless in an institution. Wealth we have yes, and food and raiment in abundance and much, over-much of the pleasures of life, but of the spiritual values which make for family union and cohesion, we of this generation take scant heed.

#### "KEEPSAKES FOR HEAVEN"

I have spoken very plainly, ladies and gentlemen, more plainly than is to the liking of one of my position, but it seems that the hour is here when those on the watch-towers should sound the words of alarm, prudently, of course, and temperately, yet strongly. If I have exaggerated, it has been quite unconsciously, and far from my intention. And the solution? There is but one—a reaffirmation of the sanctity of life, a re-stressing of the dignity of human parentage, a reiteration that life is worth living, then only when we have made sacrifices, that we are happy not in proportion as we get things out of life, but only in proportion as we put worth-while things into the lives of others. The curse of today is individual selfishness, yet the happiest family life entails a deal of yielding and self-forgetfulness. The cure then of tomorrow, as it was the safeguard of yesterday, will be self-sacrifice. Only when the father realizes that it is his privileged duty to think for and toil for his wife and little ones; only when the mother is convinced that home-making is no "part-time"

job, as a recent writer says it is, but the biggest, noblest life's work woman has ever done or ever can do; only when our young folk are taught that self-restraint means self-protection, and that purity is the priceless crown of youth and the cherished memory of olden years—then and then only will our family life be safe. And to those of us who still look beyond the grave for a home sweeter by far than the fairest home on earth, father will be to mother, and mother to father, and children to parents, loved ones who are loaned by God as "keepsakes for Heaven."

## **The Price of Social Peace and Progress**

REV. ALBERT MUNTSCH, S.J.

**W**E have had some gloomy prophecies of late that western civilization has reached a crisis and that it cannot survive in its present form. Shortly after the European War the British Labor Party in 1919 stated in the famous Reconstruction Program that the old social order prevailing before the war should not be reconstructed. Something better was desired. Oswald Spengler, a German philosopher, has written a widely discussed book under the significant title: *The Downfall of Western Civilization*. This has been translated into English and has made great impressions.

### **WHAT IS A SOCIAL PROBLEM?**

Now if civilization is to survive man must find a solution for the urgent social problems of our day. The proper solution of all that this problem includes will be the price of social peace and progress.

A social problem means any social situation which attracts the attention of a considerable number of competent observers within a society and demands a remedy by social action. The greatest and most fundamental of such problems are those presented in the world of labor, that is, they are largely economic and industrial. This is readily

seen when we recall the seriour labor disturbances, the many strikes and lockouts of the last twenty-five years.

In fact some identify the social question of our day with the labor question. From this viewpoint the social question is the problem presented by the sum of the evils from which society, and especially the working class, is suffering in the religious, moral, economic and political order.

But from what evil is man suffering in the religious order? There is a false philosophy abroad which looks upon man as a mere working machine. Yet man is more than a mere working machine for producing "the largest output of some commodity at the minimum expense to his employer." Every man, no matter how lowly, has certain inherent rights which no one can take away. Among them are: the right to live; the right to be educated, not only in religion but also in secular knowledge; the right to the enjoyment of liberty; the right to labor; the right to rest and recreation; and the right to perform his duties to his Creator. These rights spring from the very constitution of man, and are in no way due to the enactment or concession of society.

Now these rights and essential claims of every person, which are a sort of natural capital, and which he cannot surrender, have quite often been ignored. In the many labor disturbances of the last half century we often have illustrations of one party disregarding the rights of the other party in the controversy.

#### THE SOCIAL QUESTION AT BOTTOM A RELIGIOUS AND MORAL QUESTION

Now why has there been so flagrant a disregard of individual rights in many industrial disputes of the last quarter of a century? The courts of law have been kept busy trying to adjudicate contested questions between the labor unions and employers. And yet despite all these court cases there has not been developed a body of law adequate to cover the many sources of friction between capital and labor.

What is the reason of this failure of our courts of law? The reason is that social questions, and more especially industrial disputes, have a moral and ethical bearing which is often overlooked. Experts in industrial matters

have frequently attacked the problem of social peace the wrong way. Rev. Jeremiah C. Harrington says in his recent book, *Catholicism, Capitalism or Communism* (page 317): "It was precisely because the classical economists committed this great error of divorcing religion and ethics from economics that their teaching has fallen into such unpopularity and disrepute. They constructed to their own taste what they imagined to be the ideal economic man."

But whenever industrial disputes were settled on the basis that man is merely a "working machine," with no higher interests than those of an economic order, the settlement was not lasting. When, however, the contending parties succeeded in showing that grievances really existed, and that these were opposed to Christian justice, a remedy was generally found. For the American people stand for fair play and whenever it could be shown that justice was violated, the people took the side of the aggrieved party. Hence it was not an appeal to force or a threat to have recourse to dynamite that brought redress of wrongs to one of the parties. It was an appeal to the eternal, adamant, Christian moral code, which forbids oppression of one's fellowman.

Rev. D. A. McLean, professor at the Catholic University of America, has developed this idea in his article on "Re-Christianizing Industry" in *Columbia* (January, 1926). He says:

For the establishment of harmony in our social and industrial order no mere surface measures will suffice. As the causes of our industrial unrest are deep-seated in the social and industrial organism, so any remedy to be really permanently effective must be applied at the root of the trouble. What the unthinking often term Bolshevism or Socialism is at times but a Christian revolt against the selfish spirit of our individualistic rationalistic Capitalism that sprang into being after the Reformation when a Machiavellian pagan philosophical theory involving an absolute divorce from moral principles became dominant in political and industrial life.

Any effort to provide an adequate solution must necessarily fail as long as men hold to the erroneous opinion that economic struggles are to be solved independently from Religion. As John Stuart Mill said: "The political and economic struggles are in the last analysis religious struggles," and so all attempts to prescribe a remedy for our great social and industrial problems, which ignore their vital, religious and moral phases are bound to prove disastrous. Well has Pope Leo XIII pointed out that the social question instead of being "merely an economic one is in point of fact first of all a moral and religious matter, and for that reason

its settlement is to be sought mainly in the moral law and the pronouncements of religion."

Only when the eternal verities of justice and charity, so long divorced from modern industrial and social life, are re-enthroned in their proper place in society, governing all our social relations and especially those of labor and capital, can we look for real enduring harmony in the world.

#### DEBAR FALSE TEACHINGS FROM THE SCHOOLS AND THE PLATFORM

A prolific source of social unrest and of industrial quarrels is found in the false philosophic teachings propagated in schools, text-books and from lecture platforms. One of the most disastrous of these teachings is that man is a mere machine, that he has not a free will.

But if the individuals of any group act on this principle, and commit grievous wrongs against society, why blame them? If they are not free in their actions, they are mere machines. But machines are not responsible agents, they cannot be guilty of right or wrong conduct. Such false philosophy merely helps to foment social disorder.

Another sacred doctrine that is often ridiculed is that of the immortality of the human soul. If the professors and the so-called pace-setters laugh this truth to scorn, what can be expected of others who look for guidance to those in the seats of the mighty? Will not the unlearned be tempted to live up to this fearful doctrine and try to snatch all the prizes they can, during their short sojourn on earth, if life holds no promise beyond the grave? M. Étienne Lamy, of the French Academy, says:

Experience teaches that the man who places all his hopes in the present life, is better than his principle if he is good, if he forgets himself, if he sacrifices himself. He lives in contradiction with that principle every time that he does not satisfy with all the ferocity of egoism his need of immediate enjoyment. There is little chance that he will at the same time resist instinct and reason, and this is the reason why unbelief is anti-social.

Christianity accepts the two philosophic truths of the freedom of the individual and the immortality of the human spirit. Now a person who has these great prerogatives, even though he bend down to a life of toil and grimy labor, is essentially free. He is free from within. His spirit may soar aloft.

According to Christian ethics there are certain individual rights which man does not receive from society. Among these are the right to live, to labor, the right to liberty, to education and even to rational amusement after the day's toil. Through the teachers of Christianity, man becomes free in the industrial order; for Christianity teaches the dignity of labor; it teaches that man is not a cog in the industrial machine but is a being endowed with certain inalienable rights and privileges.

Christianity makes man free in the moral order for there is no real slavery today except the slavery to sin and passion and vice and criminal tendencies. A man who sins deliberately and whose conscience is guilty of serious sin is really a slave, though outwardly he be free; for he becomes a slave to sin and passion and to his own lower and base desires.

Christianity preaches the dignity of the soul in the state of sanctifying grace, that is, the state in which the soul is free from the foul blot of serious sin. Christianity, too, by its splendid teachings and economy of grace, helps us all, no matter how sorely we be tempted to fight sin and to keep our souls unsullied.

Finally, Christianity insists on man not acting according to the changing fashions or own personal opinion, but to regulate his conduct on the unchanging principles of Christian law and ethics. Many persons unfortunately are slaves to human respect. They are afraid to do right because someone may laugh at them if they do what is right or do not join in the gang when evil is going on. But now Christianity tells us to do right, and fear no one.

It gives to those who obey the moral law, the right to enjoy, what St. Paul calls, the priceless liberty of the children of God.

#### ANOTHER REQUISITE OF SOCIAL PEACE

We will not be blessed with the vision of social peace in our country unless we first re-establish in its pristine honor and glory the bulwark and mainstay of all social progress and prosperity. This is the family—the fundamental unit of society.

As we look over society we see, especially in our country, that there are disintegrating factors at work making for the dissolution of this fundamental social unit. An



absolutely essential requisite for social peace is the re-establishment of the family on a sound Christian basis. Are we not in danger of becoming a homeless people? What has become of the American Home? How many today can really appreciate the sweet and inspiring lessons brought out in that great eulogy of the true and happy American home, Whittier's *Snow-Bound*? Our young people are apt to sneer at that picture, for they try to find their sole diversions on the streets and boulevards, in the parks and theaters, the dance-halls and amusement parlors, of the city. In the meantime the good old family spirit perishes. A well-known sociologist has said that

many a twentieth-century father scarcely sees his young children from Monday morning to Saturday evening. Taking it all in all, the influence of the family upon its members, young and old, is decidedly less than it was a few generations ago. In view of the fact that the family is the unit of social organization, the importance of this development can hardly be overestimated.

There must be, too, a more consistent training of the child in the family and by its natural guardians—father and mother. This holy duty must not be given to the State, and we must oppose every move giving to Congress, or to a Washington official the right to regulate the life and privileges and duties of the family. Thinking men now are again willing to admit that there is no institutional substitute for home training and for family discipline. The more the public institutions undertake, the more the parents shirk.

### WRONG ROADS TO SOCIAL PEACE

Many of our public men and leading thinkers have given time and study to the question here discussed. But their suggestions are not always practical. Professor Ross, of the University of Wisconsin, published a book two years ago, under the title, *Roads to Social Peace*. His "Social Peace Program" contained the following measures: Avoidance of sectionalism, quenching of sectarian strife, promotion of peace among nationalities, the mitigation of class struggle, and the allaying of town versus country conflict. But does not this program merely scratch the surface? Does it not fail to point out the larger factors of social discontent? As his scheme is typ-

ical of that launched by other reformers, we repeat here a criticism we made of Dr. Ross' book at the time of its publication.

"Sectionalism," "Sectional Strife" and "Nationalism" are by no means the main obstacles to social peace. There are other, more far-reaching and fundamental evils that block the way to this desirable goal. There is the wide prevalence of crime, the increasing contempt for decisions of courts of law, the corruption in high Government circles. There is also the scorn for legislative bodies and the contemptuous attitude of many towards any measure proposed by such bodies.

Connected with these evils is the failure of Governments, especially in our country, to inaugurate a really practical program of social reform and to eliminate the wretched by-products of the present economic and industrial order—unrestrained competition, periods of unemployment, periodical strikes and labor disturbances, class favoritism, control of legislation by money power, etc., etc. Incidental to all this is the political spoils system. Nor would it be wrong to mention as one source of social disorder the repeated attempts by unscrupulous organizations to start waves of religious prejudice and to inject the religious issue into our political campaigns, as has been done in so many ways during the last two decades of our political history. As for venal newspapers, which are neither guided by high social principles nor governed by any definite allegiance to the cause of real social welfare, who can estimate their power as a check to the coming of the era of social harmony and brotherhood?

Viewing the obstacles to social peace and reconstruction from another angle, we notice the increase of divorce and the break-up of home life and family life. We see the American home becoming a place to eat in and sleep in, without any semblance of the old-time family spirit of solidarity and mutual love and cooperation. There is too the decay of religion and the abandoning of "church-going" by thousands, more accurately, by millions of our people.

Following upon the heels of these deplorable manifestations in the social life of America, comes the unrestrained quest for sensational pleasure, with a tell-tale sequel of insanity and suicide. Another consequence of this

mad pursuit of the phantom of pleasure is the increasing contempt for work, especially manual labor and domestic service.

Intertwining its baneful effects with the social plagues just alluded to, is a system of education which practically eliminates the helpful and inspiring force of religion from the school, without offering a substitute for this agency, which as even Ross must admit, is a powerful form of "social control." For as Principal Jacks has said in one of his recent addresses:

Reality, Religion and Education seem to me to form an indivisible unity. Take them apart and all three will be misunderstood. Each of them needs the light that is thrown upon it by the other two. . . . If the battle of civilization is lost in the schools, who is going to win it afterwards? . . . What are the chances for the Community of Nations, unless the basis for it is laid in education?

#### SUMMARY

What then is the price we must pay for the return of social peace and for the means of social progress? We must, first of all, try to solve our social problems in the light of the principles of Christian social reform. These have been laid down by Pope Leo XIII, by Bishop von Ketteler and in the Catholic Reconstruction Program. We must realize that every man has certain individual rights which he did not receive from society but which belong to him as essential claims upon society.

We must debar from the schools and from the rostrum perverse teachings which sow the seeds of bitter discontent and of anarchy in the masses. We must safeguard the dignity of the workman, and remember that he "liveth not by bread alone." We must treat him as an individual having the aforementioned rights, and as one called to ultimate fellowship with God in the Kingdom of Heaven. We must reestablish the family on a sound Christian basis, and cultivate once more the Christian "home-spirit." We must inculcate everywhere, but above all we must practice, the duty of obedience to lawful authority. We must not be satisfied with preaching the "evils of sectional strife," but must look deeper and eradicate those sins and vices and moral evils which prompt man to transgress the commandments of God and offend his fellowman.

If a solution is to be found which will give us a warless world, it will be when we have educated a foolish world to realize the benefits of peace among all men, irrespective of race, creed, color, or nation. It will be found when our education will cease to exalt a false patriotism and the exploits of war, and when we put into their place a regard for international amity and a recognition of the triumphs of peace. In the education of youth we must parallel and even supplant such phrases as "Don't give up the ship!" "I'll fight it out on this line if it takes all summer!" "Remember the Maine," "Lafayette, we are here!" with those nobler expressions as Washington's "Let foreign engagements be fulfilled in perfect good faith," or the more familiar words of Lincoln, "With malice toward none, with charity to all," or the more graphic phrase of Sherman, "War is hell!" We must teach the patriotism of a Wendell Phillips as expressed by another patriot, John Boyle O'Reilly:

A sower of mighty seed was he,  
A woodman who hewed toward the light,  
Who dared to be a traitor to country  
When country was traitor to right.

This change in national ideals will not be accomplished in a day, nor by the enthusiastic efforts of those lovers of mankind who would impetuously take war out of the vocabulary of the world and establish overnight an Elysium of peace. We must deal with history, with tradition, with education, with human nature and all its frailties, and most of all, with that subtle thing called "national honor."

What has the Catholic Church to offer on this question of peace and war? Its doctrine of war, which is an application of the principles of justice to a phase of interstate relations, has not changed in essence since it was first formulated. It is the same today as it was before the World War, because even more paramount than the colossal crime of that fruitless war are the eternal principles of ethics. It is the same as it was when Grotius wrote his *De Juri Belli et Pacis* in 1625, or when a few years before (1623) a French monk, Eméric Crucé in his book, *The New Cýneas*, proposed to the monarchs

of his day the first international peace congress to be held in the city of Venice. It is the same as when the Church under the egis of the Cross drove from Europe the Turk and his menacing crescent. It is the same as when Leo the Great repulsed Attila at the gates of Rome, after the Goth had sacked the treasures of Europe. It is the same as when the early Christians were martyred by Nero. It is the same as when Paul, preaching peace, ordained submission to authority as submission to God Himself. It is the same as when the Great Master who though He declared that all who take the sword shall perish with the sword, also declared "On the chair of Moses have sitten the Scribes and Pharisees, all things which they command you, keep and do," though he added, "but according to their works do ye not."

The attitude of the Catholic Church is unchanged because its position is fixed in the absolute demands of justice, but this does not imply that the change in ideals and forms of government, the advance in national civilization, the growth of humanitarian feeling, and the lessons of experience have not modified the expression and the application of that attitude. Many motives for warfare which were formerly tolerated are now seen to be unsound and many old customs in prosecuting war are now rejected (in theory at least) as uncivilized. Human rights are more clearly expressed and more clearly recognized by belligerents—at least we hope they are.

War is essentially a conflict between two or more groups of human wills carried on in the physical plane. There is no other way of compelling assent than by physical force, when appeals to reason, to conscience, to self-interest, to affection, fail. The responses to these appeals, of their very nature, depend on the free consent of persons, a consent that ultimately cannot be forced precisely because it is free. This is true of nations as well as of individuals, because, in the last analysis, individuals speak for the nation. When two sovereign States disagree on some matter of vital import and cannot settle their differences by process of reasoning, by compromise, or by arbitration, they generally appeal to force, or to a threat of it. Equivalently one says to the other, "You are unjustly depriving me of something

ical of that launched by other reformers, we repeat here a criticism we made of Dr. Ross' book at the time of its publication.

"Sectionalism," "Sectional Strife" and "Nationalism" are by no means the main obstacles to social peace. There are other, more far-reaching and fundamental evils that block the way to this desirable goal. There is the wide prevalence of crime, the increasing contempt for decisions of courts of law, the corruption in high Government circles. There is also the scorn for legislative bodies and the contemptuous attitude of many towards any measure proposed by such bodies.

Connected with these evils is the failure of Governments, especially in our country, to inaugurate a really practical program of social reform and to eliminate the wretched by-products of the present economic and industrial order—unrestrained competition, periods of unemployment, periodical strikes and labor disturbances, class favoritism, control of legislation by money power, etc., etc. Incidental to all this is the political spoils system. Nor would it be wrong to mention as one source of social disorder the repeated attempts by unscrupulous organizations to start waves of religious prejudice and to inject the religious issue into our political campaigns, as has been done in so many ways during the last two decades of our political history. As for venal newspapers, which are neither guided by high social principles nor governed by any definite allegiance to the cause of real social welfare, who can estimate their power as a check to the coming of the era of social harmony and brotherhood?

Viewing the obstacles to social peace and reconstruction from another angle, we notice the increase of divorce and the break-up of home life and family life. We see the American home becoming a place to eat in and sleep in, without any semblance of the old-time family spirit of solidarity and mutual love and cooperation. There is too the decay of religion and the abandoning of "church-going" by thousands, more accurately, by millions of our people.

Following upon the heels of these deplorable manifestations in the social life of America, comes the unrestrained quest for sensational pleasure, with a tell-tale sequel of insanity and suicide. Another consequence of this

mad pursuit of the phantom of pleasure is the increasing contempt for work, especially manual labor and domestic service.

Intertwining its baneful effects with the social plagues just alluded to, is a system of education which practically eliminates the helpful and inspiring force of religion from the school, without offering a substitute for this agency, which as even Ross must admit, is a powerful form of "social control." For as Principal Jacks has said in one of his recent addresses:

Reality, Religion and Education seem to me to form an indivisible unity. Take them apart and all three will be misunderstood. Each of them needs the light that is thrown upon it by the other two. . . . If the battle of civilization is lost in the schools, who is going to win it afterwards? . . . What are the chances for the Community of Nations, unless the basis for it is laid in education?

### SUMMARY

What then is the price we must pay for the return of social peace and for the means of social progress? We must, first of all, try to solve our social problems in the light of the principles of Christian social reform. These have been laid down by Pope Leo XIII, by Bishop von Ketteler and in the Catholic Reconstruction Program. We must realize that every man has certain individual rights which he did not receive from society but which belong to him as essential claims upon society.

We must debar from the schools and from the rostrum perverse teachings which sow the seeds of bitter discontent and of anarchy in the masses. We must safeguard the dignity of the workman, and remember that he "liveth not by bread alone." We must treat him as an individual having the aforementioned rights, and as one called to ultimate fellowship with God in the Kingdom of Heaven. We must reestablish the family on a sound Christian basis, and cultivate once more the Christian "home-spirit." We must inculcate everywhere, but above all we must practice, the duty of obedience to lawful authority. We must not be satisfied with preaching the "evils of sectional strife," but must look deeper and eradicate those sins and vices and moral evils which prompt man to transgress the commandments of God and offend his fellowman.

# The Revolt of Eight Million

BROTHER BARNABAS, F.S.C.

*Reprinted in part from "Columbia"*

THERE are eight million boys in the United States between the ages of 12 and 18, all but a small number of whom have been deprived of an inalienable right. It is the right of every American boy to be under the close guidance and leadership of a red-blooded man. . . .

Not so long ago, this need was supplied through existing agencies. But the years that have seen the ox cart give way to the automobile, the candle to the electric light and the sailing vessel to the ocean greyhound, the submarine and the *aéroplane*, have brought changes in our social structure. Some fifty years ago, the natural model for the boy was his father, with whom he associated intimately in the work of the farm, or in the enterprises of the little shop or store. . . . The advance of our almost human machines has developed industrial plants where the man works, and the boy no longer follows.

But the boy will have his hero; he is so constituted by nature. The nearest substitute for the father was for a time found in the male teacher—the old-fashioned schoolmaster. Here our nation has a heavy charge to answer. The services of the teacher, invaluable to the boy, were little appreciated, and so poorly rewarded that they were claimed by business and better remunerated professions. . . .

The professionally trained leader is needed, who will devote his life to the work of boy guidance, and to the problems of boyhood. This profession is one of the most difficult and delicate in the world. It demands the highest qualifications of character and education, and deserves compensation commensurate with its value. In addition to the professional worker, there is also need, in even greater numbers, for the volunteer, for the man who likes boys, and wants to be with them. But he must be a trained volunteer.